

NEW YORK TIMES

DATE FEB 69

PAGE 42

Foes of Antimissile Net Increase In Senate Attacks on Pentagon

Kennedy Joins Sentinel System Critics as Others Plan Inquiry Into Influence of the 'Military-Industrial Complex'

By JOHN W. FINNEY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 1—The Defense Department is being caught in a pincer movement in the Senate. A bipartisan coalition threatening to block the deployment of a ballistic missile defense system and to investigate the influence of what former President Dwight D. Eisenhower called the "military-industrial complex."

Not since World War II has the Pentagon been so placed on the defensive on Capitol Hill.

It now appears that close to a majority of the Senate is opposed to the Sentinel antimissile system, a five-year nationwide project designed to provide a "thin" shield against Chinese weapons by detecting approaching missiles with radar and intercepting them with nuclear-armed antimissile missiles. With the opposition to the Sentinel anti-organized, it is likely that the Senate will refuse later this year to vote further funds for the \$5-billion network.

Political 'Folly' Seen

Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, the Senate Democratic whip, openly joined the battle today with a letter to Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird protesting that it would be political "folly" and a serious technical mistake for the United States to commit billions of dollars to build a yet unproved missile defense system.

In his first public statement on the issue, Senator Kennedy proposed that the Administration impose a freeze on the construction of sentinel sites while it conducts a National Security Council review into the desirability of deploying a missile defense system.

"Such a freeze," he said in a four-page letter, "would make a definite contribution to the cause of world peace, would reassure the nation that our national defense programs are sound and rational, and would heighten the possibility that we will be able to deal more effectively with our domestic needs."

Meanwhile, the Pentagon faces a broader attack on another flank by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which provided the hard core of resistance to the Sentinel system.

With considerable secrecy so as not to arouse the jurisdictional jealousies of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee is proposing to set up a special subcommittee to investigate the global and domestic activities of the Defense Department.

Foreign Policy Impact

Obviously the subcommittee would look into the nation's global commitments and their impact upon foreign policy. But this mandate would be but a vehicle for investigating the impact and influence of the military establishment.

Thus the investigation would probably go into such issues as the command and control being exercised over military units, such as the Pueblo intelligence ship, indoctrination programs conducted by the Pentagon to educate the public on foreign policy issues, the political use made of military aid programs in underdeveloped countries, as in Latin America, and Pentagon sponsorship of nonmilitary social science research.

The subcommittee probably would be headed by Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri, a choice that illustrates the changing attitude in the Senate toward the Defense Department.

By seniority rights, Senator Symington, a former Secretary of the Air Force, should take over the chairmanship of the Senate Preparedness subcommittee, which is the principal defender of military programs.

But Senator John Stennis of Mississippi, chairman of the parent Armed Services Committee, will retain the helm over the influential subcommittee. So Senator Symington is likely to become chairman of a rival subcommittee that should develop into the principal critic of the Pentagon.

That Senate attitudes toward the Pentagon were changing became apparent last year when Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky, led what amounted to a one-man battle against the Sentinel system. While the battle is still being led by Senator Cooper, the opposition this year is much better organized and has recruited such young activists as Senator Kennedy and Senator Charles H. Percy, Republican of Illinois.

Futile Assaults

In his letter, Senator Kennedy argued that technically there was "no conclusive evidence" that the Sentinel system would work, he said that from a political standpoint the Sentinel system would "vitalize an unparalleled opportunity to lessen world tensions" through an economic standpoint such a system would be so costly as to cause "a distortion of Federal funding priorities."

Noting that there has been considerable discussion of the "peace dividend" that would be made available with the end of the Vietnam war, he said:

"It is my opinion that we would do more to divide the

country than unite it should we apply this dividend, whatever it may be, to deployment of an ABM system rather than to our domestic housing, employment, health, education, conservation and other needs."

In a series of futile assaults last year on the initial \$647-million installment for the Sentinel, Senator Cooper surprised the military establishment in the Senate by corraling 42 Senators to his side.

This year the Defense Department is requesting \$1.4-billion in deployment funds. As the request has grown, so also in the opinion of such Senators as Mike Mansfield of Montana, the majority leader, has the opposition mounted to the Sentinel.

Opponents of the Sentinel can now count on about 45 votes in the Senate, and with a few switches and recruits among freshman Senators they can command a majority.

Whether the opposition can win over the crucial few votes depends in large measure upon how emphatically the Nixon Administration comes out in favor of the Sentinel.

During his confirmation hearings earlier this month, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird said he had "some questions whether we should push forward simply with a system that defends against the Chinese threat only."

But then at a news conference this week, Mr. Laird, echoing the arguments of his pre-

decessor, Clark M. Clifford, said the United States should proceed with the Sentinel system to strengthen its bargaining position in any missile-control negotiations with the Soviet Union.

The Laird Logic

As far as the Sentinel opponents are concerned, this Laird logic plays into their hands, for it questions how the United States can improve its bargaining position against the Soviet Union by building a system whose effectiveness has not been established and which is designed against the Chinese, not the Russians.

Even for defense against Chinese missiles, the opposition has obtained intelligence, information challenging the value of the Sentinel. Thus, in intelligence briefings, Senator Cooper has obtained estimates that Communist China would be capable of producing in small quantity relatively sophisticated nuclear warheads, which, with the assistance of such penetration aids as decoys, would be capable of overcoming the Sentinel system.

As a result of last year's battle, the opposition has already won one important concession from the Senate military establishment which should help it prepare a case against the Sentinel.

Last year the Senate Armed Services Committee held routine hearings on the Sentinel, with only Pentagon officials testifying. This year, at the request of Senator Cooper, the committee has agreed to hear independent experts, giving the opposition the opportunity to present, for example, the testimony of former Presidential science advisers who have opposed deployment of an ABM system.

Resistance Building

The opposition should also be aided by another political factor, namely the local resistance building up in some communities that have been selected for Sentinel bases.

Until the Army started buying and clearing Sentinel sites, the debate was fought out on very abstract terms. But now the debate is acquiring a political backlash as the Senators hear from constituents opposed to the location of a Sentinel base in their communities.

Senator Percy, for example, is receiving 750 to 1,000 letters a week from constituents opposed to a Sentinel site in the Chicago area. If Senator Percy is feeling such political pressure, so presumably is Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois, who as Senate Republican leader probably holds the key to the outcome of the Senate debate on the Sentinel system.

A question being asked in Senate circles is whether Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat of Washington, who is up for re-election in 1970, will be ready to stand up as the principal Senate champion of the Sentinel system now that opposition is developing in Seattle to a proposed Sentinel site.

~~SECRET~~

JOURNAL

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Wednesday - 29 January 1969

25X1

1. [] Called George Murphy, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy staff, to clarify plans for the upcoming (but as yet unscheduled) briefing of the Joint Committee. Murphy recommended a general review of Soviet and ChiCom nuclear weapons programs and delivery capabilities, mention of the Soviet ABM system, [] programs, recent NATO security cases as they might affect U.S. atomic information and anything else the Director might feel pertinent. He said the Director might get questions regarding the overall strategic balance between the U.S. and the USSR regarding nuclear capabilities. Dr. Chamberlain, D/SI, Bruce Clarke, D/SR, and [] OCI, have been alerted to start preparing the material.

25X1A

25X1A

25X1

2. [] Senator Stuart Symington (D., Mo.) called to say he would like to take us up on the Director's invitation for a briefing at the Agency preparatory to his upcoming trip to Europe and the Middle East. He said he would prefer a working lunch probably on Tuesday, 4 February and would like to bring Mr. Arthur Kuhl, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff. The Senator said he fully understood how busy the Director was and would not want to interrupt his schedule but would like to hear from a couple of Agency specialists regarding current figures on Soviet bomber production and the Middle East situation. Recalling our lunch in Greece a year ago, he said he would like to talk with me about current conditions in Greece.

25X1A

25X1A

Mr. Bruce Clarke, D/SR, has been informed and has designated [] to handle the Soviet bomber and other military matters, and [] OCI, has been alerted to cover the Middle East situation.

25X1

3. [] Obtained confirmation to attend the 4 February breakfast briefing from the following Congressmen: Glenn Anderson (D., Calif.), William V. Chappell (D., Fla.), and Patrick T. Caffery (D., La.). I was advised that Lawrence J. Hogan (R., Md.) and Manuel Lujan, Jr., (R., N.Mex.) will be unable to attend.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Friday - 31 January 1969

Page 2

25X1 4. [] Met with Senator Stuart Symington (D., Mo.) and discussed plans for his trip. He said that:

- a. he was travelling in his capacity as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee;
- b. he would not visit any Arab countries but would like a briefing on the Arab situation;
- c. he has scratched Adana from his schedule;

25X1A

[]

He asked suggestions as to how he could get a briefing on the Arab world without visiting an Arab country. I told him that [] had considerable experience in Arab matters, but if he was not visiting an Arab country it would be best to be briefed here before departure. He said he hoped the Arab situation could be covered when he visits Headquarters Tuesday, 4 February, and if he has to cancel the lunch he would nevertheless want to reschedule a meeting for this purpose.

25X1A

The Senator's office has since cancelled the luncheon date but will be in touch about a time for the briefing.

25X1 5. [] Accompanied [] OCI, to brief Senator John Stennis (D., Miss.) on Soviet Bloc, Middle East and Vietnam situations. Also present were Ed Braswell, Staff Director of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and William Spell, Staff Assistant to Senator Stennis. (See Memorandum for the Record)

25X1A

25X1 6. [] The office of Rep. Charles A. Vanik (D., Ohio) called and cancelled a personnel interview for [] because of illness. They will advise us regarding a new appointment.

25X1A

25X1 7. [] In response to his question earlier in the week, I advised Mr. Ben Gilleas, Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, that a check on [] revealed no record of the individual.

25X1A

SECRET

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Friday - 31 January 1969

Page 3

25X1 8. [] Talked to Mrs. Pruyn, Assis- 25X1A
25X1A tant to Representative Frank Stuberfield (D., N.Y.), and advised that
the Agency had not been able to identify []
[], as a present or former Agency employee. Mrs. Pruyn
thanked me for the Agency's efforts and indicated that she had not yet
heard from Army or the FBI. No further action is required.

25X1 9. [] Talked to Mrs. Oneta Stockstill,
Executive Secretary, House Armed Services Committee, who advised
that the following individuals have been assigned to the Armed Services
Committee by seniority in the order named. Democrats: Richard C.
White (Tex.), Bill Nichols (Ala.) Jack Brinkley (Ga.), Robert H.
Mollohan (W. Va.), and W. C. Daniel (Va.). Republicans: Charles W.
Whalen, Jr., (Ohio), Ed Foreman (N. Mex.), John E. Hunt (N.J.) and
G. William Whitehurst (Va.). Resident Commissioner Jorge Cordova
has also been assigned to the Committee.

25X1 10. [] Talked to Mr. Robert Michaels,
House Appropriations Committee staff, who advised that Representatives
Evans of Colorado and Edwards of Alabama have been added to the
Appropriations Committee membership. Representative Glenn Davis
of Wisconsin is being assigned to the Defense Subcommittee to fill the
vacancy created by Mr. Laird's appointment as Secretary of Defense.

25X1 11. [] Met with Mr. Art Kuhl, Chief Clerk,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and provided a limited briefing
on certain intelligence systems. I also received from Mr. Kuhl,
appropriate documentation on the briefing.

25X1 12. [] Met with Miss Edna Paxton, Appoint- 25X1A
ment Secretary to Representative Walter Flowers (D., Ala.), who con-
firmed that the Congressman will be attending the Tuesday breakfast.

[]
JOHN M. MAURY
Legislative Counsel

cc: O/DDCI
Ex/Dir-Compt
OPPB
DD/I; DD/S; DD/S&T
EA/DDP; Mr. Houston; Mr. Goodwin

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1A Item 3 - [] O/Sec.
Approved For Release 2007/02/07 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000200010094-2
Item 6 - O/Personnel

SECRET

Journal - Office of Legislative Counsel
Monday - 27 January 1969

Page 3

25X1

9. [redacted] in response to his call of Friday, I talked to Mr. Arthur Kuhl, Chief Clerk, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and advised him that our Headquarters has notified the field that Mr. David R. Calhoun, Jr., Major General John R. Murphy, Jr., as well as Mr. Kuhl, himself, each have top secret clearances. In response to his questions, I also advised, with the unlikely exception of the Senator moving into areas of operational or other sensitive Agency matters which would be discussed with him alone, that little difficulty should be encountered in the briefings. Mr. Kuhl thanked me for the advice.

25X1

10. [redacted] Met with Mr. Robert Michaels, House Appropriations Committee, and reiterated the information that had been provided Mr. Sprankle on Friday that the Agency cannot fulfill the type of request made by Representative Riegle on behalf of his Assistant, Mr. Carl Blake. I further noted that I know of no instance where such a request had ever been honored. Mr. Michaels noted that he had felt this to be the fact and that as I requested, he would pass it on to the Chairman and Mr. Bow. He will advise me as to the outcome. (See Journal of 24 January 1969.)

25X1

11. [redacted] Met with Mr. J.R. Blandford, Chief Counsel, House Armed Services Committee, who advised that he has heard nothing further concerning [redacted] but that he will advise as soon as they arrive back in town. As he had indicated previously, he has no knowledge of their areas of expertise and requested that I work out the matter of the proper persons to meet with them when they call.

25X1A

I briefed Mr. Blandford, and later Mr. Slatinshek, on the following items: Communist propaganda tactics; Paris negotiations; North Korean objectives in current actions against South Korea; ChiCom construction of hydrofoil gun boats and torpedo boats; Soviet capability to develop small manned space stations; Soviet construction of new SA-3 sites; and possible effect of France's cancellation of the 1969 nuclear test series.

25X1

12. [redacted] Met with Mrs. Coralee Bull, Personal Secretary to Representative L. Mendel Rivers, who requested that I call in the morning to establish a time for Admiral Taylor to meet with the Chairman.

SECRET